



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,616	03/18/2004	Jonathan Barsade	BAR-6	5894
24039	7590	02/06/2009	EXAMINER	
INNOVAR, LLC			ERB, NATHAN	
P O BOX 250647				
PLANO, TX 75025				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/803,616	Applicant(s) BARSADE ET AL.	
	Examiner NATHAN ERB	Art Unit 3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5 and 7-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5 and 7-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21-23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 23, 2009, has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Applicant's response to Office action was received on January 23, 2009.
4. In response to Applicant's amendment of the claims, the objection to claim 8 from the previous Office action is hereby withdrawn. However, please note the new claim objections below in this Office action.
5. Applicant argues against the rejection of claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. 101 on the basis that the preambles of each of these claims recite each "logic engine" residing on a node within a wide area network. Applicant further directs Examiner's attention to a portion of the specification which states that a node is independently selected from a computer, server, or gateway. Examiner notes that Applicant has resolved ambiguity over whether this limitation should be incorporated into the claims by explicitly incorporating this limitation of a node into the end of the body of each of these claims.

Art Unit: 3628

However, Examiner is still not persuaded to remove these rejections because these claims still do not explicitly, clearly require a computer-readable medium. For example, in the current forms of these claims, a node may be a gateway. It is unclear whether a gateway must be a physical device, or may be a communication gateway in the form of communication software, for example.

In order to help overcome these rejections, Examiner suggests the following amendments:

Please amend the preamble of claim 21 to read:

21. A computer program storage device readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a computer program of instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for providing a transaction client logic engine, residing on a node within a wide area network, said method steps comprising:

Examiner also suggests changing part a of claim 21 to a wherein clause and moving it toward the end of the claim, since "including" is not the best active verb for a method step.

Please amend the preamble of claim 22 to read:

22. A computer program storage device readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a computer program of instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for providing a third party fee calculation client logic engine, residing on a node within a wide area network distinct from the nodes of a first party and a second party, said method steps comprising:

Examiner also suggests changing part a of claim 22 to a wherein clause and moving it toward the end of the claim, since "including" is not the best active verb for a method step.

Please amend the preamble of claim 23 to read:

23. A computer program storage device readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a computer program of instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for providing a third party fee fulfillment client logic engine, residing on a node within a wide area network distinct from the nodes of a first party and a second party, said method steps comprising:

Examiner also suggests changing part a of claim 23 to a wherein clause and moving it toward the end of the claim, since "including" is not the best active verb for a method step.

In addition, Examiner has noticed that claims 1, 5, and 7-20 should also be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Please see the actual rejections below in this Office action for further details.

6. In response to Applicant's amendment of the claims, the corresponding prior art rejections have been correspondingly amended below in this Office action.

7. Examiner believes that the amendments to the prior art rejections below in this Office action render Applicant's arguments no longer applicable.

8. In response to Applicant's comments regarding the rejection of claim 17, note that Examiner has used Official Notice for the disclosure of the element/limitation of claim 17, not Sullivan.

Claim Objections

9. Claims 21-23 are objected to because of the following informalities:

a. In the third-from-last line of claim 21, please insert the word --wherein-- before the word “the.”

b. In the fourth-from-last line of claim 22, please insert the word --wherein-- before the word “the.”

c. In the fourth-from-last line of claim 23, please insert the word --wherein-- before the word “the.”

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

10. Claims 1, 5, and 7-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claim is directed to a computer program, without the computer-readable medium needed to realize the computer program's functionality. Note that a “logic engine” can be interpreted to be a computer program. Therefore, the claim is directed to nonstatutory functional descriptive material. See MPEP 2106.01(I).

With respect to claims 1, 5, and 7-20, more specifically, these claims are directed to a “system,” yet the body of the claims include no language requiring physical structural components of such a system. Therefore, these claims are being treated as improper software claims. Examiner suggests that these rejections with respect to claims 1, 5, and 7-20 be overcome by amending these claims to require the physical

Art Unit: 3628

structural components of said system, as that appears to be what was intended by Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. Claims 1, 5, and 7-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0093320 A1, in view of Agee et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0097303 A1.

As per **Claim 1**, Sullivan discloses:

- a client logic engine-based system for handling calculation and payment of one or more third party fees due to a third party as part of one or more wide area network transactions between a first party and a second party, wherein the first, second and third parties are users of distinct first, second and third nodes, respectively, of the wide area network (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraph [0124]-[0126]);

- a wide area network comprising multiple nodes enabling the transfer of transaction data information packets between the first party and the second party (paragraph [0046]);

- a transaction client logic engine, residing on a node within the wide area network distinct from and at a different locale than the nodes of the first and the second party, that: includes rules of logic for the determination of what action is required on transaction data information packets; receives one or more transaction data information packets related to one or more wide area network transactions between the first and the

second party; determines what action is required on received transaction data information packets; and based upon said determination, transmits the information packets: between a third party fee calculation client logic engine and itself, or between a third party fee fulfillment client and itself (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraph [0054]; paragraph [0061]; paragraph [0124]-[0126]; paragraphs [0130]-[0131]);

- a third party fee calculation client logic engine, residing on a node within the wide area network distinct from the nodes of the first and the second party, that: includes rules of logic for the determination of fees owed to a third party on one or more transactions between the first and the second party; receives one or more information packets from a transaction client logic engine; determines the third party fees owed on the transaction between the first and the second party; and transmits to the transaction client logic engine or a third party fee fulfillment client logic engine, a transaction data information packet including said third party fees owed (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraph [0054]; paragraph [0061]; paragraphs [0124]-[0126]; paragraphs [0130]-[0131]);

- the first party is a consumer and the second party is a merchant (Figure 1; Figure 3F).

Sullivan fails to disclose wherein the tax system components are divided in the manner specified in claim 1 among multiple computers at separate nodes of the network which communicate with each other. However, Sullivan discloses that its system may be divided among multiple computers at separate nodes of the network which

Art Unit: 3628

communicate with each other (paragraphs [0130]-[0131]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Sullivan such that the tax system components are divided in the manner specified in claim 1 among multiple computers at separate nodes of the network which communicate with each other; in doing so, its system would be divided among multiple computers at separate nodes of the network which communicate with each other, as disclosed by Sullivan. The modification would have been obvious because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Sullivan fails to disclose placing the tax system as an intermediary between buyer and seller with a payment processing gateway such that the tax system receives transaction data from the payment processing gateway. Agee et al. discloses placing the tax system as an intermediary between buyer and seller with a payment processing gateway such that the tax system receives transaction data from the payment processing gateway (paragraph [0043]; paragraph [0045]; paragraphs [0084]-[0086]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Sullivan such that the tax system is placed as an intermediary between buyer and seller with a payment processing gateway such that the tax system receives transaction data from the payment processing gateway, as disclosed by Agee et al., since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of

Art Unit: 3628

ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **Claim 5**, Sullivan fails to disclose wherein the tax system components are divided in the manner specified in claim 1 among multiple computers at separate nodes of the network which communicate with each other. However, Sullivan discloses that its system may be divided among multiple computers at separate nodes of the network which communicate with each other (paragraphs [0130]-[0131]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Sullivan such that the tax system components are divided in the manner specified in claim 1 among multiple computers at separate nodes of the network which communicate with each other; in doing so, its system would be divided among multiple computers at separate nodes of the network which communicate with each other, as disclosed by Sullivan. The modification would have been obvious because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **Claim 7**, Sullivan further discloses wherein the wide area network is the Internet (paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]).

Art Unit: 3628

As per **Claim 8**, Sullivan further discloses wherein the merchant is an on-line merchant having a website resident on a node of the wide area network, the transaction is an on-line electronic transaction conducted over the wide area network, and the consumer is obtaining a good and/or service from the merchant (paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]).

As per **Claim 9**, Sullivan further discloses wherein the electronic transaction is an e-commerce payment transaction (paragraph [0046]).

As per **Claim 10**, Sullivan further discloses wherein at least one of the third parties is a government agency and at least one of the third party fees is sales tax (paragraph [0007]; paragraph [0036]).

As per **Claim 11**, Sullivan further discloses wherein at least one of the third parties is a logic engine service provider that controls the system and provides for calculation and/or payment of at least one third party fee to the government agency (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0061]; paragraph [0122]; paragraph [0124]-[0126]).

As per **Claim 12**, Sullivan further discloses wherein at least one of the third party fees is a fee due to the logic engine service provider (paragraph [0122]; paragraph [0124]-[0126]).

As per **Claim 13**, Sullivan further discloses a logic protocol that calculates the amount of third party fee due to the logic engine service provider (paragraph [0122]; paragraph [0124]-[0126]).

As per **Claim 14**, Sullivan further discloses a logic protocol that affects payment of a third party fee to the logic engine service provider (paragraph [0122]; paragraph [0124]-[0126]).

As per **Claim 15**, Sullivan further discloses a logic protocol that determines if a transaction data information packet is to be transmitted to the third party fee calculation client logic engine or the third party fee fulfillment client logic engine (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraph [0054]; paragraph [0061]; paragraph [0124]-[0126]; paragraphs [0130]-[0131]).

As per **Claim 16**, Sullivan further discloses a logic protocol that determines if third party payment data is to be added to the transaction data information packet, and, if so, adds the payment data (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0046]; paragraph [0061]; paragraph [0122]; paragraph [0124]-[0126]).

As per **Claim 17**, Sullivan fails to disclose an authorization and capture client agent. However, that element/limitation was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 3628

art at the time of applicants' invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to modify the invention of Sullivan such that it includes an authorization and capture client agent, as was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention. Motivation is provided in that it was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention that an authorization and capture client agent is useful for processing credit card payments in online transactions.

As per **Claim 18**, Sullivan further discloses a service provider fee logic engine, residing on a node within the wide area network, that includes rules of logic for the determination of a third party fee owed to a service provider of the system (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraph [0122]; paragraph [0124]-[0126]).

As per **Claim 19**, Sullivan further discloses wherein the third party fee due to the service provider is a fixed fee (paragraph [0122]).

As per **Claim 20**, Sullivan further discloses wherein the third party fee due to the service provider is a prorated or incremental fee (paragraph [0122]).

As per **Claim 21**, Sullivan discloses:

- a transaction client logic engine, residing on a node within a wide area network (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraphs [0124]-[0126]);

- includes rules of logic for the determination of what action is required on transaction data information packets (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraphs [0124]-[0126]);

- receives one or more transaction data information packets related to one or more wide area network transactions between a first party and a second party (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraphs [0124]-[0126]);

- determines what action is required on received transaction data information packets (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraphs [0124]-[0126]);

- based upon said determination, transmits the information packets between a third party fee calculation client logic engine, if present, and itself, or between a third party fee fulfillment client logic engine, if present, and itself (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraph [0054]; paragraph [0061]; paragraph [0124]-[0126]; paragraphs [0130]-[0131]);

- the transaction client logic engine resides on a node of a wide area network and at a different locale than the first party and second party, wherein at each occurrence, a node is independently selected from a computer, server or gateway (Figure 1; paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0038]; paragraph [0039]; paragraphs [0124]-[0126]; paragraphs [0130]-[0131]).

Sullivan fails to disclose wherein the tax system components are divided in the manner specified in claim 21 among multiple logic engines which communicate with each other. However, Sullivan discloses that its system may be divided among multiple logic engines which communicate with each other (paragraphs [0130]-[0131]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Sullivan such that the tax system components are divided in the manner specified in claim 21 among multiple logic engines which communicate with each other; in doing so, its system would be divided among multiple logic engines which communicate with each other, as disclosed by Sullivan. The modification would have been obvious because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Sullivan fails to disclose placing the tax system as an intermediary between buyer and seller with a payment processing gateway such that the tax system receives transaction data from the payment processing gateway. Agee et al. discloses placing the tax system as an intermediary between buyer and seller with a payment processing gateway such that the tax system receives transaction data from the payment processing gateway (paragraph [0043]; paragraph [0045]; paragraphs [0084]-[0086]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Sullivan such that the tax system is placed as an intermediary between buyer and seller with a payment processing gateway such that the tax system receives transaction data

Art Unit: 3628

from the payment processing gateway, as disclosed by Agee et al., since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

12. Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan.

As per **Claim 22**, Sullivan discloses:

- a third party fee calculation client logic engine, residing on a node within a wide area network distinct from the nodes of a first party and a second party (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraphs [0124]-[0126]);

- includes rules of logic for the determination of fees owed to a third party on one or more transactions between the first and the second party (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraphs [0124]-[0126]);

- receives one or more information packets from a transaction client logic engine (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraph [0054]; paragraph [0061]; paragraph [0124]-[0126]; paragraphs [0130]-[0131]);

- determines the third party fees owed on the transaction between the first and the second party (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraphs [0124]-[0126]);

- transmits to the transaction client logic engine, a transaction data information packet including said third party fees owed (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraph [0054]; paragraph [0061]; paragraph [0124]-[0126]; paragraphs [0130]-[0131]);

- the third party fee calculation client logic engine resides on a node with a wide area network distinct from and at a different locale than the nodes of a first party and a second party, wherein at each occurrence, a node is independently selected from a computer, server or gateway (Figure 1; paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0038]; paragraph [0039]; paragraphs [0124]-[0126]; paragraphs [0130]-[0131]).

Sullivan fails to disclose wherein the tax system components are divided in the manner specified in claim 22 among multiple logic engines which communicate with each other. However, Sullivan discloses that its system may be divided among multiple logic engines which communicate with each other (paragraphs [0130]-[0131]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Sullivan such that the tax system components are divided in the manner specified in claim 22 among multiple logic engines which communicate with each other; in doing so, its system would be divided among multiple logic engines which communicate with each other, as disclosed by Sullivan. The modification would have been obvious because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **Claim 23**, Sullivan discloses:

- a third party fee fulfillment client logic engine, residing on a node within the wide area network distinct from the nodes of a first party and a second party (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0122]; paragraphs [0124]-[0126]);

- includes rules of logic for the determination of fees owed to one or more third parties on one or more transactions between the first and the second party (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraphs [0124]-[0126]);

- receives from a transaction client logic engine, if present, or a third party fee calculation client logic engine, if present, one or more information packets containing data for the transfer of transaction funds between the first and the second party (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraphs [0124]-[0126]);

- determines the third party fees owed on the transaction between the first and the second party (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraph [0054]; paragraph [0061]; paragraph [0124]-[0126]; paragraphs [0130]-[0131]);

- causes the deduction of the third party fees owing from funds transferred between the first and the second party (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraph [0054]; paragraph [0061]; paragraph [0124]-[0126]; paragraphs [0130]-[0131]);

- causes the transfer of the third party fees to said one or more third parties (paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0046]; paragraph [0054]; paragraph [0061]; paragraph [0124]-[0126]; paragraphs [0130]-[0131]);

- the third party fee fulfillment client logic engine resides on a node with a wide area network distinct from and at a different locale than the nodes of a first party and a second party, wherein at each occurrence, a node is independently selected from a computer, server or gateway (Figure 1; paragraphs [0005]-[0007]; paragraph [0038]; paragraph [0039]; paragraph [0122]; paragraphs [0124]-[0126]; paragraphs [0130]-[0131]).

Sullivan fails to disclose wherein the tax system components are divided in the manner specified in claim 23 among multiple logic engines which communicate with each other. However, Sullivan discloses that its system may be divided among multiple logic engines which communicate with each other (paragraphs [0130]-[0131]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Sullivan such that the tax system components are divided in the manner specified in claim 23 among multiple logic engines which communicate with each other; in doing so, its system would be divided among multiple logic engines which communicate with each other, as disclosed by Sullivan. The modification would have been obvious because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Conclusion

13. **Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular portions of the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant, in preparing the responses, fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Erb whose telephone number is (571) 272-7606. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays, 8:30 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on (571) 272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3628

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nathan Erb
Examiner
Art Unit 3628

Nhe

/John W Hayes/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628